

: - Athens, Georgia 30602-7415 U.S.A. amateur radio N4TMI : ** *** ** <><

Date: Sun, 11 Apr 1993 20:15:14 GMT
From: n3dmc!johnl@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Cable TVI interference
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Ed Wells (edw@wells.UUCP) wrote:

: It seems to me that the cable TV industry decided to use the same
: frequencies in the cable that are used as many other ham and/or commercial
: frequencies outside the cable, and now that leakage/acceptance is occurring,
: they don't know how to deal with the monster they've created,
: or their irate customers (who probably are demanding refunds).

I think the cable company has it backwards (as usual). The cable companies were allowed use of frequencies currently allocated to other services on the condition that they not cause harmful interference to those services and that they accept any interference caused by legitimate users of those services. If your friends signal is getting into the local cable distribution network it indicates that the cable company is not properly maintaining their system. It also means that their cable system may be exceeding FCC limits on cable leakage. The FCC has been cracking down on cable systems that have excessive leakage, esp. in the aviation bands.

--

John A. Limpert
johnl@n3dmc.svr.md.us
uunet!n3dmc!johnl

Date: Mon, 12 Apr 1993 05:43:13 GMT
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!lapin@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Cable TVI interference
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In article <C5C5LE.IEr@n3dmc.svr.md.us> johnl@n3dmc.svr.md.us (John Limpert) writes:

>Ed Wells (edw@wells.UUCP) wrote:

>: It seems to me that the cable TV industry decided to use the same
>: frequencies in the cable that are used as many other ham and/or commercial
>: frequencies outside the cable, and now that leakage/acceptance is occurring,
>: they don't know how to deal with the monster they've created,
>: or their irate customers (who probably are demanding refunds).

>

>I think the cable company has it backwards (as usual). The cable companies

>were allowed use of frequencies currently allocated to other services
>on the condition that they not cause harmful interference to those
>services and that they accept any interference caused by legitimate
>users of those services. If your friends signal is getting into the local
>cable distribution network it indicates that the cable company is not
>properly maintaining their system. It also means that their cable system
>may be exceeding FCC limits on cable leakage. The FCC has been cracking
>down on cable systems that have excessive leakage, esp. in the aviation
>bands.

>--

>John A. Limpert
>john1@n3dmc.svr.md.us
>uunet!n3dmc!john1
>

John:

As you stated, the letter of the law is exactly correct. But the original post was much more bothersome. If I understood it correctly, the cable company understands the law but is trying to use local, neighborhood, propaganda to force the ham station off that frequency.

Also, the original posting mentioned that the FCC had been contacted but did not say what happened.

The original poster asked for reponses via email rather than netnews. I, for one, would be very interested in reading the responses and also learning what the final disposition of the case is when it happens.

This is a thread that is ripe for a switch to rec.radio.amateur.policy. I hope to see more of it there.

Greg Lapin, KD9AZ
glapin@nwu.edu

Date: Sat, 10 Apr 1993 17:10:23 GMT
From: valinor.mythical.com!n5ial!jim@uunet.uu.net
Subject: fido node regurgitating articles in rec.radio.amateur.*
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

please excuse the cross-posting, but I'm seeing this in all 3 r.r.a groups, so in this case, it seems appropriate....my apologies if this isn't a valid assumption (but then, the post actually only gets sent once either way, so it's not as if it generates any extra net.traffic or anything).

it would seem that once again, there is a fido node somewhere that seems to

think that the rest of the world wants to see duplicate copies of every single post. anyone know how to handle this?

for example, in rec.radio.amateur.policy (when I finally decided I wasn't imagining things), I saw a post from greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas). a few articles later, guess what....that exact same post is repeated. however, this time the article claims to be from Greg.Dolkas@f716.n109.z1.his.com (Greg Dolkas).

the last time I saw this was about a week ago in comp.os.linux, and it was a fido node that wasn't configured right, or something like that. the symptoms were identical, and just as could quickly become the case here, it was no doubt costing a lot of \$\$\$ for some folks (a high-volume newsgroup is bad enough...but when someone decides to double that volume with duplicate postings, that's *REALLY* bad).

anyone know how to proceed in getting these duplicates stopped?

--jim

--

#include <std_disclaimer.h>

73 DE N5IAL (/4)

INTERNET: jim@n5ial.mythical.com | j.graham@ieee.org ICBM: 30.23N 86.32W
AMATEUR RADIO: n5ial@w4zbb (Ft. Walton Beach, FL) AMTOR SELCAL: NIAL

E-mail me for information about KAMterm (host mode for Kantronics TNCs).

Date: 11 Apr 93 21:20:50 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!enterpoop.mit.edu!eru.mt.luth.se!kth.se!lysator.liu.se!
pme@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: GRAPES vs (?) WA4DSY ?
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

What is the differens ? Or is it the same modem ? Modulation ?
And where do I get it ? Do I find it at any hamshops ?
Is there different versions ? And how much do I have to pay ?

/Peter SM5OHI

Date: Mon, 12 Apr 1993 05:30:46 GMT
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!lapin@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Is this a valid Belgian call sign?
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In article <jvp.734403143@cpre1.ee.iastate.edu> jvp@vlsi4.ee.iastate.edu (Jim Van Peursem) writes:

>
>Hi,
>
> I was just contacted by a Belgian ham via postal mail. He wrote his
>call sign as ONL4456. Can this be valid? The ON prefix looks right for
>Belgium, but a four number suffix? And the length of the call sign is
>seven characters! How would a call like this work in ax.25 which has
>room for only six characters plus ssid? Do they run something different
>than the standard ax.25 in Belgium?

>
>+-----+
>| Jim Van Peursem - Ph.D. Student - Ham Radio -> KE0PH |
>| Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering |
>| Iowa State University - Ames, IA 50011 |
>| internet - jvp@iastate.edu -or- jvp@cpre1.ee.iastate.edu |
>+-----+

Jim:

I have received many cards from Europe with this type of ID. They are all SWL cards. Evidently it is very common in Europe to be assigned an SWL "License". They compete in listening contests and generally appreciate your response that what they have logged was correct.

73 de Greg KD9AZ
glapin@nwu.edu

Date: 11 Apr 93 12:21:36 GMT
From: rtech!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: rec.radio.amateur reorg/RFD discussion summary 4/11
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

This article contains 5 subtopics:
Current Status of the Discussion
How to Participate in the Discussion
Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option I)
Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option II)
Notes from the discussion so far

Current Status of the Discussion

The RFD (Request for Discussion) for the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur

was posted on March 26 to news.announce.newgroups, news.groups, and all the subgroups of rec.radio.amateur. A summary of the proposed newsgroups can be found later in this article.

We have passed the half-way point in the 30-day discussion period. Current tallies of opinions posted to news.groups are as follows:

in favor: 25 people 93 articles

opposed: 14 people 30 articles

undecided or unclear: 10 people 18 articles

(the "unclear" category only includes replies that were off the subject)

These numbers may seem small by UseNet standards but it has actually been one of the larger of many ongoing discussions on news.groups. Support has been running around the 2-to-1 in favor area since the discussion started. Due to the support expressed, we expect that it will be possible to issue a CFV (Call for Votes) some time after the end of the discussion period, which will conclude on April 26, 1993.

How to Participate in the Discussion

If you have not yet expressed an opinion on the proposed split, you can make it easy on yourself by just replying to this article onto news.groups (the Followup-To line already specifies that for you) and say

I support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur

or

I do not support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur

YOUR REPLY MUST BE POSTED TO NEWS.GROUPS IN ORDER TO BE AN OFFICIAL PART OF THE NEWSGROUP CREATION PROCESS. You may cross-post to rec.radio.amateur.misc if you prefer to.

It would be even more helpful, if you support the split of r.r.a.misc, to indicate which option from the RFD that you prefer. It's OK to say you like both. They are summarized below. You can still make things pretty easy for yourself by only posting

I support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur (Option I)

or

I support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur (Option II)

or

I support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur (either option)

Here's a question to ask yourself as you consider these proposals:

Which proposal would make you more likely to vote for all the newsgroups when voting time arrives? (Separate concurrent votes will be held for each newsgroup in accordance with the newsgroup creation guidelines.)

Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option I)

(all groups unmoderated)

| Newsgroup name | description |
|----------------------------------|---|
| rec.radio.amateur.misc | all Ham radio topics not covered below i.e. video, stories, humor, new topics [no modification to existing newsgroup] |
| rec.radio.amateur.policy | regulations & policy issues [no modification to existing newsgroup] |
| rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc | packet radio & other digital modes [includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet] |
| rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip | TCP/IP via packet radio |
| rec.radio.amateur.operating | Operating procedures and questions: DX, CW, contests, propagation, repeaters |
| rec.radio.amateur.products | manufactured equipment, modifications |
| rec.radio.amateur.instruction | Ham radio instruction & examination |
| rec.radio.amateur.construction | homebrewing & experimentation |
| rec.radio.amateur.space | amateur radio in space: satellites, earth-moon-earth (EME), shuttle, MIR |
| rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services | emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS |

Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option II - "the .tech option")

(all groups unmoderated)

| Newsgroup name | description |
|----------------------------------|---|
| rec.radio.amateur.misc | all Ham radio topics not covered below i.e. video, stories, humor, new topics [no modification to existing newsgroup] |
| rec.radio.amateur.policy | regulations & policy issues [no modification to existing newsgroup] |
| rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc | packet radio & other digital modes [includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet] |
| rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip | TCP/IP via packet radio |
| rec.radio.amateur.operating | Operating procedures and questions: DX, CW, contests, propagation, repeaters |
| rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services | emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS |
| rec.radio.amateur.tech | Technical discussions about Ham Radio: construction, theory, examinations, video |

Notes from the discussion so far

The following notes may help you determine if any suggestions you are considering have already been discussed. Your opinion is important so be sure to show your support or opposition and make any suggestions you believe would help make this a better, more successful proposal.

- * There has been strong agreement that r.r.a.misc has too much traffic.
- * One of the main points made by those opposing the split has been a concern that there may be a lot of cross-posting of articles across the proposed newsgroups. r.r.a.policy was commonly used as an example.
- * Rebuttal to the cross-posting argument pointed out that even in r.r.a.policy there is currently very little cross-posting. With numbers to show this was a misconception, one person withdrew opposition and began supporting the split.
- * A point made by proponents of the split was that r.r.a.policy is not a good comparison. All the proposed newsgroups were modeled after r.r.a.packet, which was made for a subject that many Hams are interested in. r.r.a.policy was just a place to throw away an unwanted subject. Still others said that r.r.a.policy has plenty of ongoing policy-related discussion and has also worked pretty well.
- * On the subject of cross-posting, there has been some discussion about a netiquette guide like that found on rec.aviation for the past several years. The idea may be considered regardless of the result of the vote.
- * Some concern was expressed by both supporters and opposers about the Info-Hams mail list. A common concern was that the mail lists will need to match the newsgroups in order for this to work. Comments from Brian Kantor indicated a wait-and-see position. He did not rule out making new mail lists if the newsgroups pass but he is understandably not enthusiastic since he has plenty of other work to do.
- * Two people questioned why the proposal includes making a subhierarchy for r.r.a.digital.misc and r.r.a.digital.tcp-ip. It was pointed out that these were requested by users of r.r.a.packet due to the explosion of new digital modes. There has been no opposition from the r.r.a.packet community.
- * Most people supporting the split have not indicated which option (I or II) they support. It was noted that it's been difficult to determine which will be the most-likely-to-succeed choice to put on the CFV.
- * Those who prefer Option I seem to do so because the newsgroup names are clearer and more focused. It was said that r.r.a.tech is too general to differentiate itself significantly from r.r.a.misc. So the advantage is that Option I avoids some confusion. (Option I adds 7 newsgroups)
- * Those who prefer Option II (r.r.a.tech) seem to do so because it has fewer newsgroups than Option I while still offering an area for technical discussion away from r.r.a.misc. So the advantage is that Option II is not as large an increase in newsgroups. (Option II adds 5 newsgroups)
- * A preference was stated to change r.r.a.products to r.r.a.equipment. Rebuttals said that would be confusing next to r.r.a.construction. The suggestion did not have enough support to be added to the proposal.
- * A preference was stated to change r.r.a.construction to r.r.a.homebrewing. Rebuttals said that the name would not be clear enough to outsiders or

newcomers. The suggestion did not have enough support to be added to the proposal.

- * A preference was stated to change r.r.a.operating to r.r.a.dx. Rebuttals said this would eliminate coverage for many other aspects of operating a radio. (Notably, UHF/VHF repeaters.) Also, this was considered on the rra-reorg mail list prior to the RFD, where DX and repeaters were combined to make r.r.a.operating. Another suggestion was to add r.r.a.dx alongside r.r.a.operating. The suggestion does not appear to have enough support but some discussion may continue.
- * A preference was stated to add an r.r.a.bulletins newsgroup. No replies were made to a subsequent poll on the subject so the suggestion is assumed to have insufficient support. One problem was noted that it mostly overlaps rec.radio.info which serves all of rec.radio, including rec.radio.amateur.*.
- * A couple articles suggested adding an r.r.a.flame newsgroup. Most participants seem to have assumed that was said tongue-in-cheek. It has not been taken seriously.
- * r.r.a.space appears to have significant support. It will probably be on the CFV (call for votes) whether Option I or II is selected as the final model. It was noted that this will mean that Option II will add 6 newsgroups instead of 5. (r.r.a.space was previously only on Option I.)
- * A suggestion was made to add an RDF (radio direction finding) newsgroup to the proposal. The original suggestion was to call it r.r.a.jamming. Another article suggested a clearer name of r.r.a.rdf. An opposing opinion said there is not enough traffic to make a separate newsgroup for this topic. This subject is not done being discussed but does not yet have enough support in the discussion to add it to the proposal.

— —

Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com Santa Clara, CA
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

End of Packet-Radio Digest V93 #97
